DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 085 449 UD 013 955

AUTHOR	Steelman, Cecile A.; Murphy, Mervyn J.
TITLE	Increasing Compatibility in Desegregated Schools Between Elementary Educational Practices, the Curriculum, and the Concept of Whiteness.
INSTITUTION	San Francisco Unified School District, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Sep 72
GRANT	OEG-9-72-0003(207)
NOTE	41p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Educational Practice; *Elementary Education; *Elementary School Curriculum; Human Relations; Intergroup Relations; Public Schools; *Race Relations; Racial Integration; *School Integration; School Role; Socialization; Urban Education; Urban Environment; Workshops
IDENTIFIERS	*California

ABSTRACT

In the late spring of 1972, the Human Relations Department of the San Francisco Unified School District held a series of five ethnic workshops designed to aid the district in the implementation of racial desegregation. The function of this paper is to develop an "itemized and categorized" analysis of one of the five workshops. This summary was prepared from notes on four lectures presented by Dr. Dan Dodson under a grant from the Emergency School Assistance Program. The workshop upon which this paper is based was divided into four sessions. The content of the workshop can be divided into the following major topics: (1) The city as a socializing institution and its humanization through social encounter; (2) the traditional role of the public schools; (3) new educational concepts; (4) the legitimation of the authority of the schools; (5) desegregated education; and, (6) implications for educators. A section entitled "Research Notes" provides a sociological perspective on such terms as power, educational bureaucracy, and power structure. (Author/JM)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 085449

INCREASING COMPATIBILITY IN DESEGREGATED SCHOOLS BETWEEN ELEMENTARY EDUCATIONAL PRACTICES, THE CURRICULUM, AND THE CONCEPT OF WHITENESS

SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

UD 013955

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 085449

SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

INCREASING COMPATIBILITY IN DESEGREGATED SCHOOLS BETWEEN ELEMENTARY EDUCATIONAL PRACTICES, THE CURRICULUM, AND THE CONCEPT OF WHITENESS

Dr. Dan Dodson: A Summary of Four Presentations

SUMMARY, ANALYSIS, AND RELATED MATERIAL PREPARED BY:

Cecile A. Steelman

Mervyn J. Murphy

William L. Cobb
Assistant Superintendent, Community Relations

Steven P. Morena
Superintendent of Schools

September, 1972

Funded by EMERGENCY SCHOOL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM
Summer, 1972 - Component Ib
Grant #OEG-9-72-0003 (207)

TABLE OF CONTENT

Section	Page
Writers' Preface	i - ii
Introduction	1 - 2
I. The City as a Socializing Institution and its Humanization Through Social Encounter	2 - 8
II. The Traditional Role of the School	9 - 12
III. New Educational Concepts	12 - 17
IV. The Legitimation of the Authority of the Schools	17 - 18
V. Desegregated Education	18 - 23
VI. Implication for Educators	23 - 28
Research Notes	29 - 34
Bibliography	35 - 36
Addendum	1 - 22

WRITERS' PREFACE

Max Weber, one of the most important figures in the development of the field of sociology, states that the discipline of sociology is "value-free". Obviously he does not mean that the sociologist as a private figure should be free of personal values--this is neither possible nor desirable. He rather means, as Peter Berger says, that "within the limits of his activities as a sociologist there is one fundamental value only--that of scientific integrity... His job is to report as accurately as he can about a certain social terrain. Others, or he himself in a role other than that of sociologist, will have to decide what moves ought to be made in that terrain."*

On the following pages, the undersigned writers have reported accurately and completely in one document the remarks that Dr. Dodson made in four speeches before members of the San Francisco Unified School District staff. In reading this report, however, and in considering Dr. Dodson's credentials that emphasize his qualifications as a sociologist, one should not necessarily feel that all of his remarks are made from his point of view as a sociologist--or even, indeed, that sociology as a discipline has one particular point of view. In fact, the reader should recognize that Dr. Dodson is clearly not assuming simply the role of sociologist, but also that of advocate for a particular point of view. In addition, it is important to realize that in this important and controversial area there are no definitive findings that can be "handed down" to us from the field of sociology. What sociology does offer is a set of observations on the ways in which people seem to interact, accompanied by a

---

Berger, Peter L., Invitation to Sociology, Anchor Books, Doubleday & Co., Inc., New York, 1963, pages 5 and 6

number of hypotheses concerning the "whys" of these modes of interaction.

The writers would therefore strongly urge that the readers of this document take the time to explore some of the works listed in the accompanying bibliography, with particular emphasis on those that give an orientation to the field of sociology. We would also recommend that time be taken to read the Research Notes and Bibliography sections that follow the text of the Dodson speeches.

Mervyn J. Murphy
Cecile A. Steelman

"INCREASING COMPATIBILITY IN DESEGREGATED SCHOOLS BETWEEN ELEMENTARY EDUCATIONAL PRACTICES, THE CURRICULUM, AND THE CONCEPT OF WHITENESS"

A Summary of Four Presentations by Dr. Dan Dodson

I N T R O D U C T I O N

In the late spring of 1972, the Human Relations Department of the San Francisco Unified School District held a series of five ethnic workshops designed to aid the district in the implementation of racial desegregation. The function of this paper is to develop an "itemized and categorized" analysis of one of the five workshops.

This summary was prepared from notes on four lectures presented by Dr. Dan Dodson under a grant from the Emergency School Assistance Program (ESAP).

The workshop upon which this paper is based was divided into four sections. Sections I and II were held on April 19, and Sections III and IV were conducted on April 20. The content of the workshop can be divided into the following major topics:

I. The city as a socializing institution and its humanization through social encounter.

II. The traditional role of the public schools.

III. New educational concepts.

IV. The legitimation of the authority of the schools.

V. Desegregated education.

VI. Implication for educators.

In addressing San Francisco teachers and administrators on human relations in the desegregated school, with particular emphasis on white/minority interaction, Dr. Dodson speaks from the following professional background:

Education

B.A. - McMurray's College, Abilene, Texas (1930)
M.A. - Southern Methodist University
Ph.D. - New York University

Professional Experience
1936 to present - Professor of Education, New York University
1943 - 1963 - Editor of the Journal of Educational Sociology

Served as consultant in human relations/intergroup relations to the following:
Mt. Vernon, New York Board of Education
Englewood, New Jersey Board of Education
Greenberg School District #8, New York Board of Education
New Rochelle, New York Board of Education
State Department of Education of New Jersey
Human Rights Commission of Pennsylvania (specialist in de facto segregation in northern communities)
Brooklyn Dodgers baseball team, at the time of the hiring of Jackie Robinson
Washington, D. C. Board of Education (co-designer of the 1954 desegregation plan)

Served as a witness in six Federal desegregation trials and two state desegregation trials.

Professional Organizations
Fellow of the American Sociological Association
Member of Phi Delta Kappa and Alpha Kappa Delta, honorary sociological fraternities

I. The City as a Socializing Institution and its Humanization Through Social Encounter.

Dr. Dodson developed the thesis that the cities of the United States have traditionally been the center of national socialization. By this he meant that historical trends have shown that the least desirable or "marginal" citizens of the nation have made their way to the urban centers where they were not only accepted, but were transformed into sophisticated, participating citizens as well.

Dodson pointed out the fact that although many view the socializing aspect of the urban centers as a 19th century phenomenon it is, in effect, still a

viable force today. He emphasized the point that during the past fifty years a great many black Americans have migrated from the rural areas of the south to the urban areas of the north and west. This migration, he maintains, did much to absorb black citizens into the mainstream of American life. However, Dr. Dodson alluded to the fact that the great black migration of the past five decades has about run its course. He feels that the black population of the United States is near a state of social stabilization. To substantiate this point, he quoted the compensatory education enrollment figures of the major urban center inner cities' elementary schools for the past two years. According to Dr. Dodson's figures, there now seems to be a greater out-migration of blacks from the inner-cities to the suburbs than from the rural areas of the nation to the inner-cities.

Dr. Dodson evidently feels that because of the socialization of large populations of rural blacks and their subsequent social stabilization, the nation is now in the best possible position to forge ahead and truly desegregate education within its public schools. Although Dr. Dodson is quite optimistic about the "rightness" of the times for desegregation of the school system, he cautioned the members of the workshop that if the opportunity to desegregate the public schools is not now taken, it could well mean the end of public education as we know it in this country.

In order for the nation's cities to function in their historic role of socialization, limited as that role now appears, Dr. Dodson maintained that the cities must be "humanized." The best way to humanize our urban centers is to consider and act upon such important questions as who will

be allowed to go to school with whom. He states bluntly that the patterns of the urban neighborhood schools, as they are now established, cannot meet the demands of urban life in a viable manner. He cited, as example, the fact that in eleven outlying school districts in New York (predominantly white in racial makeup) there are over 34,000 vacant seats in public school classrooms due to population drops. To further make his point, he cited the case of two new elementary schools built in New York's Stuyvesant Town. He stated that most of the nation's inner-city public schools are now operating at a 60% level of utilization, because neighborhood school building patterns have not kept up with population shifts.

Developing his point on the humanization of the cities, Dr. Dodson said that one of the most important considerations that must now be dealt with is the development of urban minority groups into coalitions that will require the "white power structure", the driving force within the American urban centers, to share political and economic power. Because it is now a well accepted fact, due to such studies as the Kerner Commission Report, that the people of the United States live in a "white, racist society" and that the white power group is the privileged group, it is incumbent upon the nation's educators to do all in their power to remedy this lamentable situation. However, Dr. Dodson warns that the "controlling power group" will not share its power and privileges with the minority groups without resistance. This is why he feels that the development of powerful, effective minority coalitions which will force the white power arrangement into a social encounter may be one way, and perhaps the only way, to coerce the power structure into sharing its power and privileges. Dr. Dodson was emphatic in stating that if the sharing process is not initiated immedi-

ately the humanization of the cities, so necessary to carry out the imperative work of socialization, will be impossible.

This task, according to Dr. Dodson, will not be an easy one. As he points out, the power group of the society has a history of working in what may be termed integrative patterns rather than conflict patterns. The group in power can, in effect, manipulate integrative patterns quite effectively, whereas the manipulation of conflict (encounter) patterns oftentimes proves to be extremely difficult, if not wholly impossible. The exchange of the historic integrative techniques, so well manipulated by the power structure, for the strategies of conflict encounter will not be easy to accomplish; and it is up to the nation's educators to lead the fight in making the necessary change possible.

In Dr. Dodson's view, the power structure has always used the public education system to reenforce its position of eminence over the minorities. He says that in educating the minority children of the society the dominant power group has often used the technique of making the child feel ashamed of his heritage. When this shame is inculcated into the child, he is then indoctrinated into the social system by being taught the myths and values of the white power structure. After he has been thus "washed" by the system he is then "siphoned off" into it. Dr. Dodson meant by this that the minority child is drawn out of his minority group and placed into the social mainstream as an honorary, as it were, member of the power structure. In other words those individuals from the minority groups who could through their educational attainment offer leadership to their respective groups, are usually absorbed by the power arrangement and are thus unfortunately cut

off from their more natural minority group ties. To strengthen his point Dr. Dodson quoted Franklin Frazier, speaking for the black minority group, who describes the above process as "creating black people who are neither accepted by the black or white community - a sort of black bourgeoisie floating about in limbo."

Dodson stated that it is quite difficult to change this educational arrangement since the white power structure sets up the mechanism by which skills and knowledge are transmitted. It is through the transmission of "controlled" knowledge that the power arrangement indoctrinates children. He said that if we are to find ways of educating all children in comfort we must also find ways of modifying the present system in which knowledge is transmitted to them.

Dr. Dodson outlined possible approaches to the sharing of social power. He maintained that the development of an encounter to which all groups, minority as well as majority, may come as equals and meet each other in a positive, conflict situation may be the answer to developing a social system that allows for the necessary shared power. This would allow all groups to move toward a social structure in which differences (racial, ethnic, religious, etc.) will be respected; and one in which the "siphoning off" process that has so alienated minority groups from the social system will be ended once and for all.

The encounter envisioned by Dr. Dodson can be briefly described as a concept of "peers in power" -- a concept that hopefully will develop a culture in which everyone will be able to identify with his neighbor in comfort and security. He firmly believes that the primary by-product of such an

encounter situation can be a truly united America.

At this point in the discussion Dr. Dodson pointed to some facts that he said must be faced. He recalled that in 1954 the United States Supreme Court stated that the public schools are the chief instrument for socializing children into the society, and that the major question we must ask ourselves as citizens of a great, democratic society is: into what kind of a society do we wish to socialize our children? Dr. Dodson maintains firmly that this is still the primary question with which we must grapple today.

He warns that we must get as far away as possible from the "tribal education" he says the nation has been guilty of perpetrating. We must teach our children to respect differences. We must develop new designs for schools so that the encounter we are planning will be fully profitable.

To clarify his point on tribal education, Dr. Dodson mentioned two studies he carried out in two neighborhoods in New York City's suburbs which were made up of Italian-American communities. He said that the two public schools in these communities were treated almost as adjuncts to the neighborhood parochial school. Standards of behavior of these two populations were, due to pluralism, not held to the same kind of standards as the majority population which surrounded them. These two ethnic communities "protected" themselves from an encounter with the broad community through voluntary isolation, and consequently after three generations their children were scoring lower in school achievement tests than the children within the surrounding communities.

Dr. Dodson said that it is easy for the broader community to ignore and overlook segregated groups, and oftentimes the segregated population will experience the illusion of autonomy and self power by separating itself from the majority, but, it should be remembered, this is only an illusion.

Dr. Dodson again stressed that the development of effective coalitions in a multi-cultural community is essential if there is to be real power-sharing between the white power arrangement and minority groups. He said that Newark, New Jersey presents a glowing example as to how this may be accomplished.

In bringing the topic to a conclusion, Dr. Dodson said that he did not believe it possible to get the majority group (power structure) to share power without the minority groups putting necessary pressure upon it. He made it quite clear, however that by "pressure" he did not mean violent action necessarily, but rather a continuous, peaceful demand for shared power on the part of the nation's minorities.

Finally, in directing his attention to the members of the workshop Dr. Dodson said that he felt the most fruitful work of the District's Basic Training Teams probably would be done within the community ar large. He said that the next level of importance upon which the teams might work would be with individual school site principals. He stated that the District's training teams' major duty should be to "put across" the importance of desegregated education and to help the principals of the individual schools to achieve the kind of positive social encounter that has been discussed in this section of the workshop.

II. The Traditional Role of the Public Schools.

In reiterating the traditional role and function of the public school system within the United States, Dr. Dodson maintained that the primary capacity of the school has been to act as the "handmaiden" of the "white power arrangement." In this role the schools merely serve, according to Dodson, to transmit the values and myths of the dominant social group and to act as a siphoning-off agent in order to alienate the talented members of the racial and ethnic minorities from their heritage; and in the case of black Americans, to "sandpaper" them and thus make them over into "black Anglo-Saxons" or "honorary white citizens."

Dr. Dodson put forth the proposition that the public schools' entire thrust toward educating the minority child has been to measure his merits entirely by the extent to which he became like the dominant social group. In other words, Dodson's contention is that the American public school system has traditionally practiced a kind of social-intellectual genocide.

He hit upon the point that traditional educational theory and philosophy in this country evolved out of a linear Newtonian concept of reality that required a bureaucracy which had to be well organized and orchestrated. Also, it depended upon a body of knowledge that was approved for transmission to children; children who were to be educated into the dominant social system in a linear, progressive manner. Invariably the body of approved knowledge to be transmitted was dominated by the white power arrangement of the society, and any child who was deviant in such aspects as color or cultural background tended to be served by the schools only to the degree to which he could become "white." Dr. Dodson seems to feel

strongly that most of the "educational gimmicks", as he terms them, utilized in contemporary compensatory educational programs are in reality simply "detergents" which have been developed to "wash" minority children so as to make them as "philosophically and psychologically white" as possible.

Dr. Dodson continued by saying that traditionally educational institutions in this country have transmitted the curriculum of a "white, racist society" to minority children. He strongly stressed that now the minorities must demand a change in the traditional educational arrangement. The schools must provide the quality of encounter from which will be developed the kind of educational environment in which all of America's children can be educated in comfort. Dr. Dodson said that any social tensions that may grow out of this necessary educational rearrangement process will be well worth the struggle if the nation's children receive a better education because of it.

In further discussing the development and reenforcement of the traditional role of the public schools, Dr. Dodson laid some historical groundwork. He stated that in 1876 Herbert Spencer asked the question: "What knowledge is of most worth?" The scholars of that time (who were handmaidens of the power structure) agreed upon what was most important for the populace to know, and then everyone was carefully indoctrinated into that body of knowledge. Dodson said that this historical process of indoctrination is still in operation today. Because of this, Dr. Dodson maintains, the schools today are in reality gigantic sorting mechanisms. Their input is all children of most of the people; and, according to Dodson,

its output are people who have been "taught their place."

Dr. Dodson maintains that the major issue is not that the school teach people their place, but whether or not every child has a fair and equal chance within this important process of learning his place. Dodson says that because schools are dominated by the white power arrangement of the society they favor the children of the white power arrangement and consequently work against those children who are not included within that arrangement. Dodson stressed the point strongly that the desegregated school does not operate in this way. The desegregated school, or, as Dodson terms it, the modern school, provides encounters within its classrooms for all racial and ethnic groups and from these encounters grow an educational environment in which all children are afforded a fair and equal chance to be educated.

Dr. Dodson maintained that the traditional role that the public schools served had to a great extent turned them into what he termed charity schools. He said that if one looked at the history of the major cities in the United States one would readily see that the public schools that serve the poor and the minorities have been fundamentally charity schools. He said that this unfortunate circumstance has come about because in the nineteenth century the society needed a large body of uneducated laborers to draw upon for manual labor. Dodson feels that the public schools that served these laboring people's children were testimony to the unwillingness of the power arrangement to share community-power. The by-product of this unwillingness to share community-power has been a heritage of segregated education in this country.

When asked by a member of the workshop, Dr. Dodson defined his use of the term "charity school" in the following manner: "A charity school is that which offers a minimum of services to people. It functions without the necessary basic resources. In effect, it patronizes its clients by expecting nothing of them, and from the environment which it creates, nothing comes."

In concluding his thoughts on the traditional role of the public schools within the United States, Dr. Dodson stated that unless the schools, especially in the large urban centers, are up-dated and freed from the lamentable role of social handmaid that had been assigned them in the last century by the power structure, they might well cease to function completely.

III. New Educational Concepts.

Dealing with new approaches to improve public schools and make them more viable to contemporary American needs, Dr. Dodson quoted from a report published by the Council on American Unity entitled "Education for Einstein's World." He restated his feelings that the traditional public educational system in this country had been designed for a world made up of Newtonian concepts of linear relationships and bureaucratic structures. He said that the area in which we now find ourselves is directly related to what Toffler discusses in his book Future Shock - that is that we are now attempting to cope with the world of "related relationships," and with a world in which we find continuous shifts and complete recycling of the utilization of things to fit our needs.

According to Dodson, when things (material, psychological, or philosophical) no longer fit our needs we cast them off. To substantiate this point, Dr.

Dodson quoted Toffler's contention that the contemporary American society is substituting what he (Toffler) terms "ad-hocracy" for bureaucracy." Dr. Dan Dodson said that this means in effect that instead of creating bureaucratic slots for people where prerogatives are carefully spelled out for them, the contemporary practice is (or should be) the development of inner-disciplinary teams to break tasks down into basic units, complete them, and move on, in a systems planning approach, to other carefully defined tasks.

Dr. Dodson said that the above concepts are also touched upon in Ernest Nullby's book Education II. He maintained that if educators are to fully prepare themselves for new educational concepts they should be fully familiar with both Toffler's and Nullby's works.

Dr. Dodson recapitulated his thesis that traditionally, children marginal to the power structure learned their place in the public schools and were more often than not put into a socially subservient status position. According to Dr. Dodson, the primary function of the school has been to socialize children into the mythology and beliefs of the power structure. Educational concepts that are based in such works as Education II and Future Shock however, move the school's functions from merely forming indoctrinational patterns to developing educational atmospheres in which people of varied backgrounds may be caught in an encounter together so that they will be forced to develop new concept structures.

Dr. Dodson maintained that the "great encounter" will in effect move educators from a linear arrangement to one which is process oriented.

It is envisioned by Dr. Dodson that from a process oriented encounter in which everyone will be involved together - pupils, parents, teachers, and administrators-will come a system of education from which a new set of social values will emerge.

As an example in point, Dr. Dodson chose to speak on school guidance programs to substantiate his thoughts on new educational concepts. He said that the traditional guidance programs were rooted primarily within five basic techniques. These techniques being:

1. In the development of an individualistic psychology that undergirded the "white power arrangement" of our individualistic society.
2. In the development of guidance programs that served as vehicles to further the myths and values of the "white power structure."
3. In the development of concepts that stated that deviancy from the dominant system was to be looked upon as nothing more than a manifestation of inadequate personality adjustment requiring psychological assistance to bring about conformity. Dr. Dodson stated that this attitude emphasized the limitations of the individual rather than the limitations of the system, therefore allowing the system to escape blame, and the necessity of change.
4. In the development of guidance programs that viewed the deviant minority students in such a way as to describe him as being individually deviant rather than sub-culturally deviant; traditional guidance programs, in Dr. Dodson's view, are bound to failure because they take the techniques that have been used

to deal with individual personality deviants and attempt to apply them to the sub-cultural deviant.

5. In developing programs that ignored the fact that the sub-cultural deviant child is not the result of poor mental health, but rather that he is the product of the problems forced upon him by society.

In other words, using the five points as listed above, Dr. Dodson made the case that the traditional guidance programs were nothing more or less than rationalizations for allowing the system to "escape" necessary social and educational change.

In developing his thoughts on new educational approaches through a revamped guidance program system, Dr. Dodson li ted two major points he felt should be of great help in revamping traditional educational approaches. These points were:

1. That most minority students who display deviant behavior should be recognized as sub-culturally deviant rather than individually deviant, with the educational system at fault rather than the student.
2. That dealing with the sub-culturally deviant student should be seen as a social action process rather than a psychological process. Dr. Dodson said that the task of dealing with most minority students will be mainly in the area of reconstructing the rituals and customs of institutions so that they

serve the needs of minorities, rather than just the needs of the "white power structure."

Dr. Dodson stressed the point that the public schools in the United States have for too long ignored the needs of the racial and ethnic minorities. He said that if a new educational climate is to be established in this country it must be so established through essential areas such as guidance programs. He cautioned however that this cannot be accomplished without major changes being brought about within the educational institutions so as to meet the requirements and desires of the heretofore neglected minorities.

In conclusion Dr. Dodson warned the workshop members present that if school administrators continue to wait for "higher-ups" to take the initiative in solving critical educational problems for them they may lose control altogether. Because initiative has not been taken by educators in the past the federal courts have been forced to take on the role of educational leadership. Dr. Dodson asked the question to those present whether federal courts should be forced to move into a social area such as education, or whether it might not be more positive and beneficial if individual educators take charge and solve the pressing problems for themselves. He said that local boards of education should take leadership roles and proceed with the educational desegregation process in "their way". He stated that he felt that this would be more preferable than having it done for them by some "outside" agency such as a federal court.

Dr. Dodson gave stern warning that if educators wait too long to face and conquer the problems of desegregated education they, by lack of action,

will fragment the community and will in effect lose control of the educational process.

IV. The Legitimation of the Authority of the Schools.

Dr. Dodson feels that our schools are currently exercising an "illegitimate authority" over students and their parents. His argument is set forth in the following three points:

1. "Just powers" of government are derived from the consent of the governed; democratic societies require that those who practice authority on others do so by their consent.
2. Teachers have the consent of neither the children nor their parents----so schools are, in effect, custodial institutions. In custodial institutions, the authority figure is always harassed by those on whom he levies his authority. This resistance on the part of the governed in a custodial institution is probably indicative of good mental health; to be passive would be unhealthy.
3. The schools must legitimate their authority in the lives of minorities as well as majorities. The principal is extremely important in this process; he must be at a level (or be brought to a level) where he can act on community feedback and direct school policy through the group process rather than see himself as capable of deciding for others what is "good for them." He must come to a reconciliation with the parents and get community support for the school.

It is important to note, however, that Dr. Dodson argues against too much local control of the schools stating that it leads to a return to "tribalism" brought about by frustrations faced by minorities when they are unable to

make any impact on the institutions of the majority, which always remain in the hands of those manipulating the purse strings(i.e., the power structure).

V. Desegregated Education

A. The necessity for desegregation

According to Dr. Dan Dodson, "who goes to school with whom" is the most critical curriculum decision that a Board of Education ever makes, as it determines what kind of encounter the school is going to provide. While he acknowledges that desegregation programs --- particularly those involving busing --- create conflict, Dr. Dodson feels strongly that they are essential if the schools are to contribute to society by accomplishing two goals that he sees as being of primary importance:

1. The elimination of "tribalism" and
2. The "forging" of a "new education" that will grow as a natural result of an encounter involving all racial/ethnic groups.

Dr. Dodson does not provide a definition of "tribalism," but we can assume that he is using the term to refer to withdrawal into an ethnic/racial group accompanied by an avoidance of the individuals and institutions of other groups. Dr. Dodson sees the neighborhood school --- and the segregated situation it creates --- as the chief perpetrator of this "tribalism." The school becomes the "proprietary turf" of a fiefdom; residents develop a fear of leaving their "turf" to venture into other communities. Desegregation/integration is the key to restoring the communication that will take us beyond "tribalism."

Dr. Dodson gives two other reasons for feeling that the neighborhood

school should give way to the "community school" belonging to everyone:

1. The neighborhood school system insures that the children of the more affluent will attend schools that have received more than their fair share of the available educational resources and in which encounter with minorities can be avoided.
2. Reliance on changes in neighborhood residential patterns to accomplish desegregation can not achieve success. It insures, rather, the "freezing" of residential patterns, with the only movement being that of the minority residents of the inner city as they systematically outgrow their boundaries and incorporate an ever larger area of the urban center."

In the latter situation, Dr. Dodson notes that even as the white power structure relinquishes the inner city to minorities, it maintains financial control --- a fact which, in itself, drives the minorities further into tribalism as they find themselves unable to cope with the institutions of the power structure.

If, as Dr. Dodson says, we are unable to bring about desegregation while retaining the neighborhood school concept, then busing is obviously the alternative -- and, Dr. Dodson strongly advocates the use of busing to whatever extent necessary to achieve desegregation. He points out that figures from Evanston, Illinois show that the busing program in that city was definitely advantageous to blacks and did not harm whites.

Dr. Dodson feels that in addition to providing a better education for

minority children, desegregation programs provide an unexpected bonus for the white community as well by causing public attention to focus on quality education for all children as a response to the fear that the "mixing of bodies" will degrade the level of excellence in formerly white schools. He even claims that the nationwide funding for compensatory education was initiated because of the threat of desegregation. Once desegregation is a reality, he says, the funds and resources needed to make desegregated education successful are about the same as would have been required before desegregation if quality education were to have been provided for all. The difference is that in the face of desegregation the funds and resources are made available.

Another important benefit of desegregation mentioned by Dr. Dodson is that it ends the "siphoning off" process whereby talented minority individuals are transformed into "black Anglo-Saxons".

This focus on the process of mixing bodies is sound, says Dr. Dodson -- and he cites Skinner, Kilpatrick and Liber to substantiate his contention. Skinner says that when behavioral changes take place, attitudes will take care of themselves. Kilpatrick said people learn what they live, not what they are taught. And Liber said that it is more important to change institutions than to change the hearts of men.

Dr. Dodson sees desegregation as the process of "rearranging life space" for people.

B. Some guidelines for desegregation

In the course of his presentations in San Francisco, Dr. Dodson mentioned several factors that contribute to the creation of a successful desegregation program:

1. Busing systems must not, as they have in the past, require minorities to do most of the traveling. Every individual should bear his own part of the inconvenience.

2. Numerical balance in the ethnic/racial "mix" is very important. If any one group is of a higher proportion, majority/minority problems develop once more. Also, there must be enough of a "mix" to reenforce the individual's racial and ethnic self-concept, as was demonstrated in Dr. Dodson's study of the Roselyn, New York schools. One black child in a class can not carry his part of the "blackness situation" in the class.

3. Teaching staffs of desegregated schools should reflect the varied racial and ethnic backgrounds of the students, and should not be "mortgaged" to any one group.

C. A new direction and a new curriculum for desegregated schools. Throughout his four presentations, Dr. Dodson emphasized that a "new education for encounter" would be forged in the desegregation process. Dr. Dodson expressed a reluctance to attempt to define this "new education," stating simply that the whole content of the educational curriculum must be rethought "in dimensions that I don't believe any of us know at the present time." What Dr. Dodson says we do know about this "new education" that will emerge from the encounter between minority and majority is the following:

1. The schools can't be used to socialize children into a

system that holds that they are second-class citizens to begin with. This means that the white input into the curriculum must change to accommodate minority children and the minorities must meet whites on equal terms.

2. All groups must come together in a "healthy, free and open encounter in which it is clear that the education of none can be accomplished unless we come to a reconciliation for all." This "great encounter" will move educators from a linear arrangement to one which is process oriented and in which everyone will be involved together -- pupil, parents, and teachers. From this process a new set of values will emerge. The encounter itself will produce a new education whereby "all children of all backgrounds may be educated together in comfort."

3. "The education of the child will be measured by the extent to which all groups learn to develop new concepts of relationships to each other."

The new education and curriculum are, then, left undefined by Dr. Dodson, not through oversight but because in his opinion education must give greater attention to process, to the nature of the encounter, to the kind of relationships that evolve among us, and to the creation of climates that are conducive to working together and to dealing with our problems. "The monitoring of the encounter to the end that it is growth producing for all of us becomes, I think, the item of highest priority on our agenda;" he says, adding that it is next to impossible to create the kinds of attitudes we would cherish by didactic kinds of teaching.

People must be forced to live in shared power situations which will lead to a new citizenship. Skills and knowledge are important, but the emphasis of the future will be on the encounter and the focus must be on the quality of this encounter.

Dr. Dodson does not feel that scholarship need be sacrificed in this process. He says that the great phobia we have about scholarship is rapidly making the goals of citizenship and scholarship incompatible, however, and he feels that when the two part company scholarship becomes dangerous because bright people who do not have a commitment to citizenship values and who do not understand and respect differences can become dangerous people. Dr. Dodson says that schools must make a synthesis of scholarship and citizenship. The schools must emphasize citizenship as well as teaching skills or they may produce a class of elitists who might well destroy the entire society. He feels that this is what happened in Germany in the 1930's and early 1940's.

As a final word to those skeptical about the possible effects of the encounter on scholarship, Dr. Dodson says,

> "If the power group's children are in the encounter and they can't have a good education because of the disruption of the others until they come to reconciliation with them, then they've got to ultimately do it."

VI. Implications for Educators

When questioned about how one might implement his theories, Dr. Dodson stated that in terms of how to implement encounter education or process education, we are caught in it and in reality have no choice. What we

must do, he said, is get the interaction going and grow with the process. If a school has no problems, it has not allowed enough interaction to take place within it for problems to occur.

In the course of his speeches in San Francisco and in answering questions posed by District students, teachers and administrators, Dr. Dodson did, however, make a number of more specific comments and suggestions concerning what might constitute good educational practice in the desegregated school. These comments are paraphrased and enumerated below:

1. In order to motivate the child in the desegregated setting, we should lead the child through successive encounters in which he will need to learn what we are teaching in order to deal with the encounter. We must move to a spirit of inquiry instead of indoctrination. This is a departure from the past, when we presented a child with a standardized body of knowledge and measured his worth by the extent to which he learned it.

2. The minority teacher should not teach just "minority lore." <u>All</u> teachers must develop new ways to reflect respect for everyone.

3. Counter-productiveness results when teachers fail to assess the effectiveness (or lack of it) of old methodologies being used in a new situation.

4. The productive teacher will be able to correctly assess the make-up of the classroom power structure and work with it (as in devising seating arrangements that strategically place class leaders) in order to use group dynamics to provide

acceptance among children.

5. New techniques such as "individualization, the open classroom, etc., while valuable in many ways, may become tools to 'wash' minorities to make them "...'black Anglo-Saxons'."

6. Children must be helped to develop their differences; we must not teach them conformity.

7. The teacher must be a resource in the learning situation, as all learning ultimately is self-learning, and the performance must be the student's performance, not the teacher's.

8. "It is as natural to want to learn as it is to eat." Learning should be kept at the curiosity level. Anxiety about learning makes for learning problems.

9. "Tracking", which makes the "faster" student a "Brahman among untouchables" and the slower student a "second class citizen", is out of phase with the times in which we live. You can't socialize minority children into a social system that maintains that they are second class citizens.

10. Students live up to what is expected of them - high or low.

11. Special classes for acting out or slow children are likewise to be avoided ("I don't believe you can compensate a child for the affrontery to his selfhood by segregating him off into a separate group.") These special classes teach low self-esteem. The Coleman report indicates that such children need role models

ahead of them, and the encounter must make the "Brahmans" tolerant of the less academically facile. Labeling a child a "low IQ child" is just a new and scholarly version of "infinite damnation" and terms such as "low socio-economic class", "matriarchal domination", "cultural deprivation", "weak ego structure", and Bloom's "lack of pre-school stimulation", are cliches of the scholars of the power structure.

12. "Gifted classes" lead parents to exert undue pressure on their "gifted" child, depriving them of a normal childhood.

13. Just "mixing bodies" will not bring about needed change. What desegregation does do is provide the opportunity for a confrontation, and it is from this confrontation that change emerges.

14. The "egg crate mentality" in teaching gets in the way of positive change - teachers must be open to innovative methodologies.

15. The teacher must be helped to grow professionally. Teaching is a multi-faceted job. People in power often place limitations of human potential on those who are not in power. In this way the system doesn't have to change. It should be the teacher's job to make sure that it is the system that is to change and not the personality structure of the child.

16. We are not making enough use of the kinds of inputs that would create an appreciation of the backgrounds of others.

We are too involved in our automated society with the cognitive, scientific things, to the exclusion of the affective. The arts and humanities are important in creating the needed appreciation of different cultures.

17. Children with language problems--that is, those whose first language is not English,--should certainly never be segregated into "special groups". They should be encouraged to enter into a broad encounter so as to get as much first-hand language experience as possible.

18. The concepts of sociology show us that there must be a consistency of mores within a mass culture. It is almost impossible to hold on to a sub-culture completely. The nature of mass culture devastates to some extent sub cultures. Schools must learn to deal with this problem if we are to have a truly pluralistic society. However, a child must be free to slough off his sub-culture traits when he no longer needs them. That is, when his personality is strong enough to stand on its own he should be to enter the mainstream of the mass culture without worrying about losing his heritage.

19. Desegregation should not be a threat to the cultural heritage of children. Moreover we should reach the point in desegregated education where the child should be able to slough off his heritage when it no longer applies to his needs.

20. Ethnic groups, such as the Chinese, must not be made to feel uncomfortable -- but at the same time they do not need "Jim Crow

schools" in order to preserve their cultural autonomy and integrity."

21. While there is a need for "Ethnic Studies" programs on a short term basis, in the long run we need honesty of scholarship that reinterprets the entire past and puts these things in their proper place in the cumulative culture. To do otherwise is to fall into "tribalism". Present black studies programs at the elementary level appear unsuccessful. Teachers often are uninterested in the material or, on the other hand, place too much emphasis on it causing the child to wonder why such a "hard sell" is necessary. The materials themselves are often not very well done. As long as each group has its inning and we get into a contest about who has the best background, we are still in "tribalism". In order to create a new curriculum for a genuinely pluralistic society rather than a society in which people are "made over" in order to escape their identity (an impossibility for the black anyway because of his color), we must examine the heritage to see what has happened to each group in the past. It is not productive for one group to chide another about how it had used its power. All power groups tend to react the same way. What we need to teach is what happens to groups in powerful/powerless situations and how we move from this to a distribution of power. We have to examine how groups in power created the myths about themselves. We must recognize and understand that all groups are ethnocentric, and build upon this in the encounter to bring down this tendency to ethnocentricity and arrogance.

RESEARCH NOTES

Sociological Perspective

The terms "power structure" (with emphasis on white power structure) and "educational bureaucracy" (or just bureaucracy for that matter) have become emotion-laden in a perjorative sense. As with many emotion-laden words, they are extremely hard to define in concrete terms. Harold Hodgkinson points out that C. Wright Mills wrote an entire book on the subject of power without defining it. Hodgkinson goes on to say that the difficulty may not have been with Mills:

> Part of the difficulty is that power is so many different things. It is inherent in some positions; e.g., the Presidency of the United States. But it is also inherent in particular people as well; no two Presidents have used the power in the office in the same way. If power in an office is never used by the incumbent, one can ask whether the power still exists. What is the act by which we can infer power? Is it the ability to control the lives of others? Is it the ability and right to make decisions? Is it the ability to block or veto the actions of others? Is it the same thing as money?...Much more subtle are the questions we must ask about power occurring outside Weber's formal structure. For example, influence (which could be defined as informal or nonpositional power) may be of major importance, even though we cannot see it by looking at an organizational chart. (Hodgkinson, p. 37)

The term "bureaucracy" is used almost as a synonym for power--with the addition of a vague connotation of impenetrability and resistance to change. Max Weber defines bureaucracies as monolithic and sees them as chiefly concerned with their own internal activity, affirming the feeling of the ordinary citizen that bureaucratic institutions do, indeed resist change. Hodgkinson also agrees. The latter points out, however, that this resistance to change does not come about, as is often thought, as a result of the efforts of a cohesive "in group" to maintain a power position and to resist sharing this position

with other groups:

> Social power has been developing toward larger and larger patterns of organization...This same development can be seen in the growth of educational bureaucracies. The local school board no longer exists in vacuo...One important consequence of this development is that power is more and more a shared matter between many constituent groups...For every educational giant today there is a giant killer. Power in the hands of one man can be used for change. In the hands of many constituent groups, it tends to be used to maintain the status quo, as the power of each group tends to be cancelled out. For this reason, we must say that Weber was right about the difficulty of changing bureaucracies, but not because of their internal cohesion; in fact, just the opposite. It is the fractioning of power in the hands of constituent groups that creates the stalemate. (Hodgkinson, p. 38)

In further discussion of bureaucracy, Hodgkinson says that "Patterns of social organization are after all created, maintained, and altered by human beings who must take the responsibility for them. Bureaucratic structure is per se little more than a 'rational' system of organizing a number of people so that certain work can be done as effectively and efficiently as possible...Part of the difficulty is that bureaucracy is virtually the only concept we have to describe all large-scale collective organizations that produce goods and services. Yet the Pentagon and the Armour Meat Packing Company are dissimilar enough so that describing them both as bureaucracies indicates the need for some sharpening of terminology." (Hodgkinson, p. 33)

An insistence on accuracy of terminology is more than just an academician's debate device. It is very difficult to pinpoint real problems and seek solutions for them as long as straw men can be erected through the use of vague, emotion-laden terms. The attack on the problem can be no more precise than the understanding of the problem---and understanding hinges, among other things on precision of definition. A number of educational,

psychological, and psycholinguistic studies on communication establish the correlation between level of thought processes and the ability to verbalize with precision and clarity.

An example of the necessity for precision in order to effect social change might be found in the use of the terms "they" and "the system". Individuals from lower socio-economic groupings and members of minority groups often express feelings of impotency before "the system" in which an unidentified "they" hold the purse strings and manipulate the "power structure" as "they" seek to retain power and the status quo.

Sociologists such as Peter Berger, Max Weber and Hodgkinson do not particularly argue with individuals that feel that their lives are greatly affected by a "they". The sociologist, however, defines the "they" as well as "the system". A reasonable assumption would be that an understanding of "they" and "the system" would suggest ways of either working within that system or altering it so that it can more efficiently serve the purposes of society. Even if one were to come to the conclusion that wholesale disruption of the institutions of the present society is in order, any beginning point for the development of new, efficient and desirable institutions would be lacking without a background in what sociology and anthropology have taught us about the ways in which groups of people organize themselves and interact.

Peter Berger provides a good "primer" of sociological systems in a readable volume entitled Invitation to Sociology: A Humanistic Perspective. Berger points out that every society "stratifies"--that is, has a system of ranking. Societies differ in the criteria used to assign individuals to different levels,

and many varying classification systems may even exist within the same society. Berger says that the chief type of stratification in contemporary Western society is the class system---a system in which one's general position is basically determined by economic criteria. In a society that stratifies in this particular manner, the rank that one is able to achieve is more important than the rank into which one is born---though it is recognized that the one certainly influences the other in many instances. Another way of saying this is that class societies are characterized by a high degree of social mobility. They are also characterized by what sociologists call "status symbolism". That is, when social position is not fixed but rather subject to change, various symbols (material objects, speech patterns, dress, associations, adherence to certain philosophies, etc.) are used as indicators of an individual's social position. As Berger phrases it, "by the use of various symbols one keeps on showing to the world just where one has arrived." (Berger, p. 79)

Berger comments on the class system as follows:

> ...no amount of social engineering will change the basic fact that different social milieus exert different pressures on their constituencies, or that some of these pressures are more conducive than others towards success, as success may be defined in that particular society. There is good reason to believe that some of the fundamental characteristics of a class system, as just touched upon, are to be found in all industrial or industrializing societies, including those operating under socialistic regimes that deny the existence of class in their official ideology.
>
> (Berger, p. 82)

Nevertheless, we can truthfully argue that for many people in our society "social mobility" in our class society has not been viable. It is here that

the importance of precision in definition becomes important. If we say that "social mobility" has not been viable for a large segment of the population--notably the minority population-and we seek to change this, do we then seek the overthrow of the class system? Berger suggests that this is not the case. He says that superimposed as it were on the class system is a stratification system "far more rigid and therefore far more determinative of an individual's entire life than that of class". This is the racial system, which sociologists see as a variation of the caste system. "Indeed," says Berger, "the individual's possibilities of class mobility are most definitely determined by this racial location, since some of the most stringent disabilities of the latter are economic in character. Thus a man's conduct, ideas and psychological identity are shaped by race in a manner more decisive than they commonly are by class." (Berger, p. 83) Here we can see that a precise definition of the problem as being one of social caste pinpoints the area in which social remedy must be sought; a knowledge of how the racial caste system has worked in America gives some ideas as to how that system might be effectively changed. Berger adds the following:

> Sociology makes us understand that a "Negro" is a person so designated by society, that this designation releases pressures that will tend to make him into the designated image, but also that these pressures are arbitrary, incomplete and, most importantly, reversible .
>
> To deal with a human being exclusively qua "Negro" is an act of "bad faith," no matter whether these dealings are those of a racist or a racial liberal. In fact, it is worth stressing that liberals are often just as much caught in the factions of socially taken-for-granted repertoires as are their political opponents; only they attach opposite valuations to these factions. For that matter, those on the receiving end of negative identity assignments are very prone to accept the categories invented by their oppressors with the simple alteration of replacing the minus sign originally attached to the identity in question with a plus sign. Jewish reactions to anti-Semitism furnish classic illustrations of this process, with the Jewish counterdefinition

of their own identity simply reversing the signs attached to the anti-Semitic categories without fundamentally challenging the categories themselves. To return to the Negro example, the process heretakes the character of enjoining upon the Negro "pride of race" in the place of his previous shame about it, thus building up a counter-formation of black racism that is but a shadow of its white prototype. Sociological understanding, by contrast, will make clear that the very concept of "race" is nothing but a fiction to begin with, and perhaps help make clear that the real problem is how to be a human being. This is not to deny that counterformations such as the ones mentioned may be functional in organizing resistance to oppression and may have a certain political validity much like other myths. All the same, they are rooted in "bad faith," the corrosive power of which eventually exacts its toll as those who have painfully acquired "pride of race" discover that their acquisition is a hollow one indeed.

The following is a Bibliography that may be of help to the reader in further exploring the topics under discussion.

The works included in the bibliography have been carefully selected by the authors of this paper to extend the interested reader's knowledge and to give him a foundation upon which to continue to develop his own social concepts.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Benedict, Ruth, Patterns of Culture. Cambridge, Mass., Roverside Press, 1934.

2. Berger, Peter L., Invitation to Sociology: A Humanistic Perspective. New York, Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1963.

3. Coleman, Richard P. and Neugarten, Bernice L., Social Status in the City. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1971.

4. Dodson, Dan W., Crisis in the Public Schools: Racial Segregation, Northern Style. New York, Council for American Unity, 1965.

5. Glazer, Mona Y. and Creedon, Carol F., Children and Poverty: Some Sociological and Psychological Perspectives. Chicago, Rand McNally & Company, 1968.

6. Greeley, Andrew M., Why Can't They Be Like Us? Facts and Fallacies About Ethnic Differences and Group Conflicts in America. New York, Institute of Human Relations Press, 1969.

7. Hodgkinson, Harold L., Education, Interaction, and Social Change. New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967.

8. Howe, Reuel L., The Miracle of Dialogue. New York, Seabury Press, 1963.

9. Kvaraceus, William C., and Others, Poverty, Education, and Race Relations: Studies and Proposals. Boston, Allyn & Bacon, Inc., 1967.

10. Mead, Margaret and Baldwin, James, A Rap on Race. New York, J. B. Lippincott Company, 1971.

11. Morris, Terry, Better Than You: Social Discrimination Against Minorities in America. New York, Institute of Human Relations Press, 1971.

12. Toffler, Alvin, Future Shock. New York, Random House, 1970.

13. Trubowitz, Julius, Changing the Racial Attitudes of Children: The Effects of an Activity Group Program in New York City Schools. New York, Frederick A. Praeger, Inc., 1969.

14. Weber, Max, Basic Concepts of Sociology. New York, Citadel Press, 1962.

15. Webster, Staten W. The Disadvantaged Learner: Knowing, Understanding, Educating. San Francisco, Chandler Publishing Company, 1966.

ADDENDUM

The following material consists of a study developed in the spring of 1971 for the San Francisco Unified School District which investigates the nation-wide effect of school desegregation on the academic achievement of both white and minority students.

Because Dr. Dodson's workshop dealt primarily with the theoretical aspects of desegregation, the authors of this paper feel that the reader might well be interested in the material that follows.